



Summary of stakeholder submissions

Online consultation on the topic below was posted from September 30 to December 1, 2020. The verbatim comments received by WCB-Alberta during online consultation are reproduced below.

Policy 04-04, Part II, Application 5 – pension midpointing

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Bell Canada	Employer	I totally agree with this position. Thank you for this clarification.
Action roofing	Employer	I agree that the second midpoint should be after the PCI Assessment
Individual	Worker	personally I would let wcb the [expletive] alone let them do their jobs, keep the ucp and jason kenney the [expletive] out of it. All the ucp and jason kenney will do is [expletive] up a good system. The system works, it helps the worker, it does it with proper and timely methods. Myself I have [occupational disease] and I am going to die, my workers gone way past her job description so has everyone else at the wcb. If the ucp has a brain dont [expletive] this up like the ucp does everything else.
Individual	Worker	I believe the wcb is fine they way they are now. Any improvements that help workers are always good. But don't change the s.o.p of wcb
Individual	Other	Policy 04-04 Part II App. 5 Mid pointing was never fully understood by Adjudicators when assessing impairment. In many cases, Case Managers, DRDRB and the Appeals Commission who have no medical back grounds would mid point a PCI rating when there was no change. I shall explain and use an example: A worker is diagnosed with a work related injury and at the time of the injury, it is noted by a doctor that the worker has a diagnosed medical condition at the time of injury or develops shortly thereafter and is at MMI. At that time a PCI rating should have been given but is not due to the fact that lay persons adjudicating claims do not realize a PCI rating should be provided. Decades go by and some one like myself who is an expert in rating impairments reviews a medical file and questions why a PCI rating was not provided at MMI. A claim is filed and the Case Manager refers the medical condition to a PCI Evaluator who provides an impairment rating. Rather than providing compensation for a PCI rating from the time of MMI, Case Managers, DRDRB ad the Appeals

<i>Stakeholder</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Comments</i>
		Commission pick the half way point resulting in workers being short changed. Example: Worker diagnosed with claw foot in 1974 and a PCI rating of 2% provided 45 years later. An impairment pension should have been paid from 1984 at MMI, not a midpoint between 1984 and the present which results in short changing a worker a considerable amount of compensation.
Lethbridge College	Other	I think the proposed change makes sense. It has been working and this will just confirm that current process is now within the policy.
Individual	Worker	<i>[Removed to protect the identity of the individual. This submission was entirely related to a worker's claim and unrelated to this policy review.]</i>
ITF Association	Employer Association	Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed changes. These have been reviewed by members of the ITF Association and we have no concerns.

Online consultation posted from September 30 to December 1, 2020.